മിസ്റ്റർ ടി. എ രാമചന്ദ്രയ്യർ: - അതാണ പറയുന്നത്. ആ സഞ്ചാരപൂർത്തിയ്ക്കുവേണ്ടി രണ്ടാമതും രാമേശ്വരത്തേയ്ക്ക് എഴുന്നള്ളുകയും ചെയ്യേണ്ട അവസരത്തിൽ . . . . . .

മിസ്റ്റർ ടി. എ. രാമചന്ദ്രയ്യർ: - തൃശ്ശൂരിലെ പൌരപ്രാതിനിധ്യം വഹിയ്ക്കുന്ന മുൻസിപ്പാലിറ്റിയിൽനിന്നും അവരുടെ സ്ഥിതിപോലെയുള്ള സല്ക്കാരങ്ങൾ ചെയ്യുന്നതിനും മാല അണിയിയ്ക്കുന്നതിനുംവേണ്ടി പൌരപ്രതിനിധികളായ കൌൺസിൽ മെമ്പർമാർ തന്നെ അവരുടെ ചെയർമാനെ അഭ്യർത്ഥിപ്പെടുകയും എന്നാൽ അദ്ദേഹത്തിനു സന്ദർശിയ്ക്കുവാൻ പാടില്ലാത്തവിധത്തിൽ, ഐ. സി. എസ്സ്. ബിരുദസമ്പാദിച്ചിട്ടുള്ളയാളായ ഒരു വെള്ളക്കാരൻ ദിവാൻ അദ്ദേഹത്തിന്റെ ശക്തികൊണ്ട് അതിനെ തടസ്ഥം ചെയ്തതായിട്ടാണ് നമ്മുടെ അറിവ്. ഇതിൽ കരാഠക്കല്ല സങ്കടമുള്ളത്. തൃശ്ശൂരിലെ എല്ലാ പൌരന്മാർക്കും വളരെ ദുഃഖമുണ്ടെന്നും അവർ ഭഗ്നാശയരായിട്ടുണ്ടെന്നുമാണ് അറിയുന്നത്. മഹാരാജാവു തിരുമനസ്സുകൊണ്ട് ഇടക്കെ ഇൻഡ്യയിൽ സഞ്ചരിച്ചു തിരിച്ചെഴുന്നള്ളിയിട്ടുള്ളതുകൊണ്ട് ഈ രാജ്യത്തെ പല സ്ഥലങ്ങളിലും അദ്ദേഹം ഇനിയും സഞ്ചരിയ്ക്കുവാനിടയുണ്ട്. അത് ഇന്നോ നാളെയോ മറന്നാലോ അടക്കും. ആ അവസരത്തിലും അദ്ദേഹത്തെ ഈ നാട്ടുകാർ സല്ക്കരിയ്ക്കുവാൻ പാടില്ലെന്നാണ വരുന്നതെങ്കിൽ അതിലധികം സങ്കടം നാട്ടുകാക്കെന്താണുള്ളതെന്നാണ ഞാൻ ചോദിയ്ക്കുന്നത്.

President :— The motion speaks about the interference in the proper discharge of the civic rights of the corporation on a certain occasion. Mr. Ramachandra Ayyar, please refer to that alone.

മിസ്റ്റർ ടി. എ. രാമചന്ദ്രയ്യർ:— അതണല്ലോ പറഞ്ഞത്. ഉടനെതന്നെ തിരുമനസ്സുകൊണ്ട് നമ്മുടെ രാജ്യത്തിന്റെ നാനാഭാഗങ്ങളിലും എഴുന്നള്ളുവാനിടയുണ്ടെന്നുദ്ദേശിച്ചുകൊണ്ട് ആ പുണ്യാത്മാവിനെ സല്ക്കരിയ്ക്കുവാനും ഹാരമണിയിയ്ക്കുവാനും വേണ്ടി നാട്ടിലെ പൌരന്മാർ ചെയ്യുന്ന പ്രവൃത്തികളെ തടയുന്നതായിരുന്നാൽ അതിൽപരം സങ്കടം മറ്റെന്തായുള്ളത്? അദ്ദേഹം ഇന്നോ നാളെയോ മറന്നാലോ അടുത്തുതന്നെ എഴുന്നള്ളിയേയ്ക്കും. അതിനുമുമ്പ് ഈ സംഗതിയിൽ തടസ്ഥം വരാതെവേണ്ട നടപടികൾ ചെയ്തണമെന്നുള്ളതാണ് ഇതിലെ അത്യാവശ്യം അതിലേയ്ക്കു വേണ്ടിയാണ ഞാൻ ഈ മോഷൻ ഇവിടെ കൊണ്ടുവന്നിട്ടുള്ളത്.

President :— As I said before I am not satisfied as to the urgency. So I disallow the motion.

Adjournment Motion -
Re. the destruction of certain buildings of historic importance.

President :— There is another tabled by Dr. A. R. Menon. *Under Rule 18 of the Cochin Legislative Council Rules, I request*

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

for leave to move the adjournment of the business of the House to discuss an urgent matter of public importance, viz., the contemplated destruction of certain buildings of historical importance in Tripunithura."

It was not necessary for me to read the statement beforehand. But I read it just to make the House understand what the purport of the motion is. In the statement there is no specific mention of the buildings which are contemplated to be destroyed. Therefore, I just want to know which are the buildings and what is the historical importance of them.

Dr. A. R. Menon:—There are three buildings within the Fort of Trippunithura of historic importance—buildings which have been standing for more than three conturies. One is a building built by the Dutch and occupied by the most famous Maharaja, the Sakthan Tampuran. The other one is **Devatha Malika** which has stood against the weather and the storm for three and a half centuries and the third is a building named **Kalikkotta.** These are the three buildings of historical importance either built by the Dutch or the Portugese. The building occupied by the Maharaja I just now stated was dismantled already. Its association with the Sakthan Tampuran or the veneration resulting from its historical importance did not prevent the buildings from the hands of the builders. It has been dismantled and what is more, it had to share a fate similar to that of the tenants who were threatened by their jenmies that their building would be removed and tanks dug there. I understand that a tank is to be dug on the very spot where this ancient building with its noble traditions and associations stood. Now, Sir, that is past. What is dead is dead. The other building which is worth more than a lakh of rupees, as I understand it, a three storied building, called **Devatha Malika**, is about to be dismantled. See how insignificant an old thing is in this world! This building which might have housed great men, and noble and beautiful ladies and which might have cost a lakh of rupees is to be dismantled and handed over to the ruthless vandalism of the builder for the petty sum of Rs. 750. It has been auctioned. But it has not yet been demolished. Now, I think it is the duty of this House in keeping with the policy of British India to preserve all monuments of historical importance.

Mr. A. Sankara Poduval:—I think there was a Regulation to that effect.

Dr. A. R. Menon:—Then my case is all the more stronger. Only in that general sense that historical monuments associated with hoary traditions and venerable associations

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

must be preserved, I thought, by bringing this adjournment motion in this House, of inviting the pointed attention of the Government and the authorities concerned to the fact that the representatives of the people are against this.

Rama Varmha Tampuran :— Sir, I oppose this motion because it is a palace and being a palace it has to be prohibited under section 34(1)(b) of the Legislative Council Rules. That is what I would say at this stage. If a ruling is made on this point admitting the motion I would have my further say in the matter.

Dr. A R. Menon :— I would also point out that it is not a palace in the sense in which it is used in the Council Rules. It has become a historical building. Then, according to the Hon'ble Secretary, all those buildings which belong to His Highness the Maharaja are palaces.

Rama Varmha Tampuran :— I don't see it in that sense. It is a palace in the possession of certain Tampurans. So it affects them. The whole building is going to be demolished and a fresh palace is going to be put up on that site. Some out-houses are also going to be put up for the use of the Tampuran. It is in the possession of a Tampuran and it is being used as a palace. Therefore the motion falls under Rule 34(1)(b).

President :— I would like to know before giving a ruling something with regard to this. Rule 34(1)(b) says: "Any matter connected with the administration, management and control of palaces of his Highness the Maharaja or of any other member of the ruling family". What I want to know is whether the palace which has been auctioned or proposed to be demolished is tenanted by any member of the royal family.

Rama Varmha Tamparan :—It is at present used by a member of the royal family.

President :—Do the princes live there ?

Rama Varmha Tampuran :— I do not know. But I know that they go there, take their food there and stay there.

Dr. A. R. Menon :— Which is the building you refer to ?

Rama Varmha Tampuran :— It is known as the Dutch Palace in official communications. It is sometimes known as 'Devatha Malika' also. The name that the Hon'ble Member gave to it, I have only just now heard.

Dr. A. R. Menon :— I improved it.

President :— I do admit the force of the objection raised, but it is with reference to the meaning of the word palace that I have my own doubts.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Rama Varmha Tampuran :— It is clearly a part of the palace at present.

President :—What I want to know is whether it is a palace now. If it is not now used as a palace, the objection will not prevail.

Rama Varmha Tampuran :— It is used as a palace.

Dr. A. R. Menon :— Do the princes live there?

Rama Varmha Tampuran :— They go there.

Dr. A. R. Menon :— There is a difference between going and living there. I ask the question, is the building occupied by Princes?

Rama Varmha Tampuran :— It is part of a palace occupied by a Tampuran. It falls under 34(1)(b). The fact that it is not always occupied by princes does not prove that it is not a palace. Krishna Vilas is not always occupied by princes. It cannot therefore be said that it is not a palace. Mattancheri palace also is not constantly occupied by any one. That doesnot show that it is not a palace. Therefore the objection must prevail.

President :—The fact that it is advertised for sale and sold clearly shows that it is not to be used as a palace hereafter. Was it used as such till this moment? That is what I want to know.

Rama Varmha Tampuran :— It was used.

Mr. A. Sankara Poduval :— On a point of order. The Government position is certainly unfounded. Because clause (b) refers to existing palaces. It does not relate to the destruction of palaces. Management of a palace means that there is a palace. Control of a palace means the existence of a palace. Therefore this does not prevent us from considering a motion for the destruction of a palace. The objection is certainly untenable.

Mr. George Chakyamuri :— Even if it is not occupied by princes, it is going to be pulled down for building a new palace there. This House cannot question that.

Mr. Joseph Pettah :— We cannot question the freedom of the princes to pull down old palaces and build new ones.

President :— Have you anything more to say?

Rama Varmha Tampuran :— At this stage I do not want to add anything more. I submit that it falls under Rule 34(1)(a) and (b), and therefore this motion has to be prohibited, under Rule 19(5).

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

President :—The matter that has been brought to my notice is contained in Rule 34(1) (a) and (b). Now (b) is, "any matter connected with the administration, management and control of palaces." The subject-matter of the motion before me is neither about administration of any palace nor about its management and control. Therefore according to me, this objection cannot prevail. With regard to the other section that was pointed out.....

Mr. Thomas Manjuran :— On a point of order, Sir.....

Mr. A. Sivarama Menon :— Sir, may I state that we have had ample discussions on this question and the President is actually on his legs giving out his ruling. If I may say so, it is highly inaccurate that he is in any way interrupted in the midst of the ruling.

President :— I asked the Hon'ble Secretary whether he had anything more to say and he said that for the present he had nothing to say except the objection pointed out by him under Rule 34(1)(b). And I have given a ruling on that point that the objection cannot prevail. Now let me hear what the Hon'ble the Law Member has to say.

Mr. Thomaas Manjuran :— I submit for your consideration that this matter falls under section 11(a). It is mentioned in Rule 34. Section 11(a) reads that "It shall not be lawful for the Legislative Council to consider and enact any measure relating to or affecting the ruling family of Cochin". Now under Rule 34(1) any matter removed from the cognizance of the Council under section 11 of the Cochin Legislative Regulations, is tabooed from the ambit of the motion. It has been stated that this old palace, however venerable, is going to be pulled down for putting up another palace for the convenience of one or more members of the ruling family. As this matter affects the members of the ruling family of Cochin, it cannot be discussed in this House.

Mr. K. M. Ibrahim :— On a point of order, I respectfully submit to the Chair that it is showing unusual concessions to the Government side.

President :— Is that a point of order ?

Mr. K. M. Ibrahim :— I only bring it to the notice of the Chair.

Mr. A. Sankara Poduval :— I wish to point out that there is nothing here to show that they are going to put up a palace. It is only their statement.

Rama Varmha Tampuran :— I may inform the House

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

that we are going to build out-houses and two or three other buildings on that site.

Mr. A. Sankara Poduval :— Sir, section 11 has no application here. "It shall not be lawful for the Legislative Council to consider and enact any measure relating to or affecting". We are not considering or enacting any measure. Rule 34(1) also has no application here. I emphatically condemn the transgression of our legitimate rights and the mis-application of section 11 proposed by the Law Member should be resented to and I oppose this with all the emphasis I can command. Section 11 says "It shall not be lawful for the Legislature to consider and enact any measure". We are not asked here to consider and enact any measure. We are only asked here to consider an adjournment motion regarding the destruction of a building.

Mr. K. Achyuta Menon :—On a point of order, Sir. Can two motions be discussed on the same day? I submit it cannot be. If both the motions are allowed where is the time for discussing the two?

President :— If there is one already admitted when the second one is allowed, the second one will be discussed on the next day. Under Rule 20(2) "If the President is of opinion that the matter proposed to be discussed is in order he shall read the statement to the Council and ask whether the member has the leave of the Council." Now I am going to read the motion "Under Rule 18 of the Cochin Legislative Council Rules I request for leave to move the adjournment of the business of the House to discuss an urgent matter of public importance viz., the contemplated destruction of certain buildings of historical importance in Trippunithura."

President :— There are only 14 members supporting the adjournment and hence under the rules I am sorry that I cannot allow it.

Motion was, therefore, negatived under rule 20(3).

The Cochin Matches Excise Duty Bill (contd.)

Mr. Thomas Manjuran :— Sir, I beg to move that the Cochin Matches Excise Duty Bill be taken up and passed.

Mr. C. J. Mathew :— I second it.

Motion put and carried.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly